

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN

Bay Area to Central Valley
Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

DRAFT

Bay Area-to-Central Valley

SCOPING REPORT

January 20, 2006

Prepared for:

California High-Speed Rail Authority

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration



Bay Area-to-Central Valley

Scoping Report

Prepared by:

Parsons

January 20, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	SUMMARY.....	1
1.1	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
1.2	PURPOSE OF SCOPING PROCESS.....	1
1.3	NOTIFICATION	2
1.4	SCOPING MEETINGS	3
1.4	SUMMARY OF MAJOR COMMENTS AND ISSUES	5
2.0	SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS.....	7
	TOPIC 1: PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT	7
	TOPIC 2: ALIGNMENT AND STATION ALTERNATIVES	17
	TOPIC 3: CONNECTIVITY AND COORDINATION WITH/IMPACTS TO OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES	28
	TOPIC 4: EVALUATION CRITERIA	29
	TOPIC 5: TECHNOLOGIES	30
	TOPIC 6: PROJECT FUNDING/COST/PRIORITY	30
	TOPIC 7: HEALTH AND SAFETY	31
	TOPIC 8: ENVIRONMENTAL/PLANNING PROCESS	32
3.0	PREPARERS	35

APPENDICES

A	CEQA Notice of Preparation
B	Federal Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS
C	Scoping Meeting Announcement Postcard
D	Scoping Meeting Fact Sheet
E	Scoping Meeting Presentation
F	Written Scoping Comments
	Federal Agency Scoping Comments
	State Agency Scoping Comments
	Regional Agency Scoping Comments
	County Scoping Comments
	City Scoping Comments
	Private Organizations and Associations Scoping Comments
	Individual and Property Owners Scoping Comments
	Businesses
	Public Meeting Comment Cards

1.0 SUMMARY

This report provides an overview of the written and oral comments received regarding the Program Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Program EIR/EIS) for a Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train (HST). The purpose of this report is to summarize agency and public comments, issues and concerns. The report will be used to help decision-makers decide on the proper scope and level of environmental analysis and documentation for the project alternatives.

1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The California High Speed Rail Authority (Authority) and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) recently completed a Program EIR/EIS as the first-phase of a tiered environmental review process for the Proposed California HST system. As part of the selected HST Alternative, the Authority and FTA defined a broad corridor between the Bay Area and Central Valley generally bounded by (and including) the Pacheco Pass (SR-152) to the South, the Altamont Pass (I-580) to the North, the BNSF Corridor to the East, and the Caltrain Corridor to the West.¹ The Bay Area to Central Valley HST Program EIR/EIS will further examine this broad corridor as the next phase of the tiered environmental review process.

Later stages of HST system development will include tiered site-specific project environmental documents to assess the impacts of the individual HST projects being implemented and site(s) chosen before construction.

1.2 PURPOSE OF SCOPING PROCESS

The process of determining the focus and content of a Program EIR/EIS is known as scoping. Scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth, and eliminates from detailed study those issues that are not pertinent to the final decision on the proposed project. Scoping is also an effective way to bring together and address the concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. Significant issues may be identified through public and agency comments.

Scoping is not conducted to resolve differences concerning the merits of a project or to anticipate the ultimate decision on a proposal. Rather, the purpose of scoping is to help ensure that a comprehensive and focused Program EIR/EIS will be prepared that provides a firm basis for the decision-making process.

The intent of the California High-Speed Train Program EIR/EIS scoping process was to:

- ◆ Inform the agencies and interested members of the public about the proposed Bay Area to Central Valley study, including compliance with NEPA and CEQA requirements.
- ◆ Identify the range of concerns and program-related issues that form the basis for identification of significant environmental issues to be addressed in the Program EIR/EIS.
- ◆ Identify a range of alignments and station locations in the Bay Area to Central Valley Corridor

¹ Highway route numbers are provided only as a convenient reference for the reader, not as a limitation on the corridor to be considered.

- ◆ Identify suggested mitigation measures, strategies, or ideas and approaches to mitigation that may be useful and explored further in the Program EIR/EIS.
- ◆ Develop a mailing list of agencies and individuals interested in the future actions relative to the Program EIR/EIS.

The scoping process and the input gathered during the scoping period are documented herein for the Bay Area-to-Central Valley Corridor.

It is also important to note that even though scoping is a distinct stage in the Program EIR/EIS process, public involvement activities will actually extend throughout the entire Program EIR/EIS process. These activities allow for interaction and exchange of issues and concerns between the public, agencies, and Program EIR/EIS preparers throughout the study process. Comments on the project will continue to be accepted throughout the project; however, they will not be included in this report, which is devoted to scoping activities only.

During the scoping process, the Authority gathered information from agencies and interested members of the public regarding their questions and concerns related to the Bay Area to Central Valley Corridor HST. Comments received during the scoping process will assist the Authority and FRA in their review and evaluation of possible HST alignments and station locations included in the environmental document.

1.3 NOTIFICATION

A California state Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed to the State Clearinghouse; elected officials, local, regional, and state agencies; and interested public on November 14, 2005 (Appendix A). A Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the Federal Register on November 28, 2005 (Appendix B). The NOP and NOI presented the purpose of the project, the project limits, the need for agency input, potential environmental impacts of the project, the contact name for additional information regarding the project, and a description of alternatives to be considered.

The High Speed Rail Scoping meetings were held in conjunction with San Francisco Bay Area Regional Rail Plan public meetings. Various federal, state and local agencies; elected officials; community, business, and environmental leaders and organizations; and other interested individuals received notification of the first phase of public workshops/scoping meetings. The notification activities included legal notices, direct mail, Web postings, media advisories, e-mail blasts, and flyers, as described below. Several methods were used to notify the public of the scoping process.

- ◆ Notification of the scoping meetings was published in nine local newspapers on November 15, 2005. These newspapers were the Modesto Bee, Merced Sun Star, Fresno Bee, Stockton Record, Sacramento Bee, Daily Republic, Oakland Tribune, San Francisco Examiner, and the San Jose Mercury.
- ◆ An announcement postcard was distributed to approximately 3,175 individuals, agencies, organizations, and businesses on a mailing list derived from prior work and current project outreach. Over 1,500 addresses of public agencies, organizations, and individuals were extracted from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) contact database. The postcard provided a brief description of the project and the purpose of scoping, times and locations of scoping meetings, contacts for additional information, and contacts for additional information in Spanish.
- ◆ MTC mailed workshop flyers to its Bay Area Partnership Technical Advisory Committee, which includes representatives from Caltrans, county congestion management agencies, and local transit operators, for discussion at its meeting on October 24, 2005.

- ◆ The San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) mailed workshop flyers to 89 addresses representing its standing committee members (Citizen's Advisory Committee, Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, Manager's and Finance Committee, and Transit Operator's Working Group) on November 16, 2005.
- ◆ Information about the workshops/scoping meetings was posted on MTC's Web site: www.mtc.ca.gov; the California High-Speed Rail Authority's Web site: www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov; and the Regional Rail Plan public Web site: www.bayarearailplan.info. Also, Caltrain's Web site (www.caltrain.com) provided a link to the Regional Rail Plan public Web site.
- ◆ Media advisories/press releases were issued by MTC, including a November 17, 2005 media advisory, a November 30, 2005 press release following the first workshop/scoping meeting in Oakland, and a December 1, 2005 press release prior to the Modesto workshop/scoping meeting. MTC also responded to all press calls on the Regional Rail Plan.
- ◆ MTC sent an email blast to the Regional Rail Steering Committee on October 25, 2005.
- ◆ MTC sent an email blast out to 5,200 email addresses extracted from MTC's contact database of public agencies, organizations, and individuals on November 1, 2005.
- ◆ Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) distributed workshop flyers via a "seat drop" to over 1,350 of its morning commuters on November 10, 2005.
- ◆ SJCOG sent an email blast to 4,617 email addresses compiled as part of its I-205 Campaign on November 21, 2005.
- ◆ Some 50,000 copies of a special BART Bulletin were distributed at all 34 BART station fare gates starting on November 29, 2005.
- ◆ Caltrain distributed 6,000 workshop flyers via a "seat drop" and issued a press release announcing the upcoming San Jose, San Francisco and San Carlos workshops on November 30, 2005.
- ◆ Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) sent an email blast to email addresses representing its policy board and standing committees.

1.4 SCOPING MEETINGS

The scoping activities for the Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS were conducted between November 15 and December 16, 2005 (scoping period). The public workshops/ scoping meetings drew over 500 participants. The geographical extent and complexity of the proposed project led to scoping meetings being held in multiple locations from the Bay Area to the Central Valley.



The scoping process included six officially noticed agency and public scoping meetings (Table 1). At each location, two sessions were held, the first from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. and the second from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Each session included an open house followed by a presentation. Given the important relationship of high speed rail alignments and stations to a regional rail system in the northern California area, the High Speed Rail scoping meetings were held in conjunction with public meetings on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Rail Plan initiation meetings.



Table 1: Scoping Meeting Locations and Times

Date	City	Location/Address	Time of Public Agency & General Public Meetings
11/29/05	Oakland	Joseph P. Bort Metro Center, Larry D. Dahms Auditorium, 101 Eighth Street, Oakland	3:00–5:00 p.m. 6:00–8:00 p.m.
11/30/05	San Jose	New San Jose City Hall – Council Wing, Community Room W120, 200 East Santa Clara Street, San Jose	3:00–5:00 p.m. 6:00–8:00 p.m.
12/1/05	San Francisco	San Francisco Civic Center Complex, Hiram Johnson Building, Auditorium, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco	3:00–5:00 p.m. 6:00–8:00 p.m.
12/5/05	Livermore	Livermore Public Library, Community Room A + B, 1188 S. Livermore Avenue, Livermore	3:00–5:00 p.m. 6:00–8:00 p.m.
12/6/05	Modesto	Double Tree Hotel, Ballrooms 1, 2, and 3, 1150 Ninth Street, Modesto	3:00–5:00 p.m. 6:00–8:00 p.m.
12/8/05	Suisun City	Suisun City Hall, Council Chambers, 701 Civic Center Boulevard, Suisun City	3:00–5:00 p.m. 6:00–8:00 p.m.

Materials used during the scoping meetings included exhibits and handouts distributed at the meetings and through the Authority's Internet website (www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov). These materials included the following:

- ◆ NOP and NOI,
- ◆ Scoping meeting announcement postcard (Appendix C),
- ◆ Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train fact sheet (Appendix D),
- ◆ Scoping meeting presentation (Appendix E),
- ◆ Exhibit posters, and
- ◆ Scoping period comment card.

At each meeting, attendees were asked to sign in and provide contact information so that updates and future notices could be sent to them. Authority and regional rail staff facilitated the scoping meeting to provide general information and instruction on how to provide public comment.

Each meeting began with a one-hour open house during which High Speed Rail and Regional Rail staff were present to answer questions and discuss materials being handed out or shown on display boards around the room. Following the open house, power point presentations were made regarding the overall regional rail plan (presented by regional rail staff) and the High Speed Rail scoping process (presented by Dan Leavitt, Deputy Director of the Authority). The public was then encouraged to ask for clarification regarding either of the presentations. The remainder of the meeting was dedicated to answering questions from the attendees.

Written and verbal comments from these meetings are included and summarized in this report (see Section 2). Written comments provided via mail and via e-mail are also included. Forty-eight letters and 93 written comments cards were received during the public meetings and during the scoping period. Comment cards and letters are provided in Appendix F.

1.4 SUMMARY OF MAJOR COMMENTS AND ISSUES

There were several overall themes related to High Speed Rail at every public meeting, as follows:

- ◆ Views on & Preferences for Southern Alignments vs. Altamont Pass Alignments are Divergent & Strong.
- ◆ Diablo Direct Alignment Would Present Severe Environmental Impacts.
- ◆ Grassland Ecological Area (GEA) is a Critical Environmental Resource.
- ◆ Should Expand Evaluation of Biological Impacts.
- ◆ Should Use HSR to Upgrade Commuter Rail Services.
- ◆ Interest, Concerns, and Requirements Regarding New San Francisco Bay Crossing.
- ◆ Systems Must be Safe and Secure.
- ◆ System Connectivity & Convenience are Key.
- ◆ Should Have Transit Oriented Development Around Stations.

Section 2 provides a complete summary of all the comments received regarding High Speed Rail.

2.0 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

The overall goal of project scoping is to lay a firm foundation for the rest of the decision-making process and to identify those areas that will require analysis in the Program EIR/EIS. The Bay Area to Central Valley Program EIR/EIS scoping process identified areas of potential concern related to the proposed high-speed train system. Forty-eight letters and 93 written comments cards were received during the public meetings and during the scoping period. Following is a summary of issues raised either by those in attendance at the scoping meetings or through correspondence and other communication. Comments are organized first by general topic and then by commetor (organzied by commentor classification). Copies of scoping correspondence, e-mails, and written comment cards are contained in Appendix F.

TOPIC 1: PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
FEDERAL AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EPA has identified potential impacts to aquatic resources of national importance, wetlands and water quality, wildlife habitat, and endangered species that would result from previously proposed Diablo Direct and Pacheco Pass alternatives. ▪ Need to demonstrate that all potential impacts to waters of the U.S. have been avoided and minimized. ▪ Design measures and modifications to avoid and minimize impacts to water resources should be quantified, e.g., number of stream crossings avoided, acres of waters of U.S. avoided, etc. ▪ Additional steps should be taken to avoid and minimize impacts to resources with special designations and special aquatic sites and waters within state, local, and federal protected lands. ▪ Include Tier 1 landscape-level data, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ List of water bodies and streams impacted (mapped on USGS 7.5 minute maps). ○ Estimates of wetland areas impacted using National Wetland Inventory database. ○ Estimate of vernal pool areas impacted. ○ Estimates of "edge-area," to quantify habitat fragmentation. ▪ Should make use of California Gap Analysis. ▪ Recommend elimination of alternatives that impact designated aquatic resources of national importance, i.e., Del Puerto Creek, Salado Creek, Crow Creek, and Orestimba Creek watersheds. EPA continues to believe that Diablo Direct alignments do not exhibit characteristics of the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). ▪ Loss of wetland from Pacheco Pass alignment, and impacts to wildlife corridors and habitat fragmentation, are not consistent with the Clean Water Act requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Significant alignment and design modifications should be applied to the Pacheco Pass alignment to reduce impacts to waters of U.S. and wildlife movement corridors. ▪ Evaluate variations to Altamont Pass alignments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would not cross the San Francisco Bay and that would provide service to San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland. ○ Make use of an improved Dumbarton Rail Bridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should conduct a thorough cumulative impact assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identify potential large, landscape-level statewide and regional impacts, as well as large-scale mitigation measures. ○ Include complete list of reasonably foreseeable actions. ○ Make use of Caltrans recently published cumulative impact guidance. ▪ Describe efforts to avoid and/or minimize impacts to threatened and endangered species and associated habitats, as well as preserves, parks, and restoration and habitat management areas. ▪ Wildlife movement corridors may be affected by fences where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HST alignment is not in an existing rail or highway corridor ○ Habitat use in existing rights-of-way occurs across roads and rail lines currently unobstructed by fences. ▪ Incorporate information from <i>California Missing Linkages Report</i>. Incorporate data from statewide California comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (to be completed early 2006). ▪ Facilitate a meeting of scientist and local experts to explore specific locations and design features for wildlife crossings. ▪ Identify wildlife connections that would remain after construction – highlight as “connectivity zones.” ▪ Disclose how fencing will affect wildlife movement and how it will be integrated with proposed wildlife passages such as culverts, bridges, viaducts, underpasses, and overpasses. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have re-transmitted comments on statewide Draft Program EIR and EIS – with particular comments noted, as follows. ▪ Grasslands Ecological Area (GEA) is critical area for Pacific Flyway waterfowl populations, with several federally listed or proposed threatened and endangered species either seasonally or year-round. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is one of largest remaining vernal pool complexes. ○ Has experienced significant investment in maintaining area. ○ Includes two FWS national wildlife areas (35,000 acres), FWS conservation easement program (70,000 acres on 170 private properties), six units of California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) wildlife area (25,000 acres), California state park, and active conservation group involvement. ▪ Evaluate effects of growth inducement on biological resources and on smaller rural communities. ▪ Need to consider Altamont Pass alignment – although have serious environmental concerns regarding a proposed bridge crossing of South San Francisco Bay. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider Altamont Pass looping south to San Jose and then north to San Francisco. ○ Consider Altamont Pass with tunnel under San Francisco Bay. ▪ BART or other mass transit can serve Oakland from a stop in Hayward. ▪ Northern Mountain crossings are in undeveloped areas, and would have significant impacts on threatened and endangered species. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would be at odds with project Purpose and Need ○ Altamont Pass is along existing transportation corridor, while Northern Mountain crossings are not. ○ Nature Conservancy owns fee title and easements on 61,000 acres, as part of Mount Hamilton Project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would result in substantial direct and indirect impacts to federally listed wildlife species – San Joaquin kit fox, California red-legged frog, bay checkerspot butterfly, various threatened and endangered plant species. ○ Would result in fragmented wildlife habitat, noise impacts to wildlife, direct and indirect loss of habitat, hydrologic changes (with adverse wildlife impacts). 	
STATE AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to address impacts on water quality from stormwater runoff from HST facilities (e.g., parking lots, stations). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Must meet National Pollution Discharge Elimination system (NPDES) permit requirements, including post construction stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) and treatment BMPs. ○ Use landscape-based stormwater treatment measures, e.g., biofilters and vegetated swales. ▪ Crossing of perennial and seasonal creeks will require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 404 permits from ACOE. ○ CWA Section 401 Certification from Water Board, and/or ○ Waste Discharge Requirements from Water Board. ▪ Board now has jurisdiction beyond areas under jurisdiction of UCOE, including creek banks (under Porter-Cologne Water Act) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider impacts on wildlife migration corridors along creek channels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ California Regional Water Quality Control Board – San Francisco and Central Valley
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Permits may be required for discharge of fill material, land disturbance, and wastewater discharge. ▪ State and regional boards need to understand how alternatives would avoid or minimize each cause of water quality degradation, effects that would remain unmitigated, and magnitude of remaining adverse effects. Effects include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Direct physical impacts to aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitat. ○ Generation of construction-related and post-construction pollutants. ○ Disruption of watershed level aquatic functions. ▪ Affected waters should be mapped and characterized – organized by waterbody type, sub-basin, and Regional Water Board jurisdiction. Should identify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acreage and linear feet impacted. ○ Level of precision. ○ How unavoidable losses will be mitigated. ○ Measures to ensure foreign constituents in fill material will not degrade water quality. ▪ Project could fill or isolate wetlands, riparian areas, or headwater streams – need to characterize such losses and mitigations. ▪ Include an alternatives analysis – compensatory mitigation should be considered only for unavoidable impacts to waters. ▪ Should evaluate fragmentation of stream and waterbody habitat connectivity, including corridor importance, potential for disruption, and potential for enhancement. ▪ Should attempt to maintain the pre-project hydrograph. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State Water Resources Control Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consistent with regulations, permits will be required at the appropriate time from the Reclamation Board for portions of the project located within regulated streams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ California Department of Water Resources

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program EIR/EIS must include Water Quality section reviewing impacts to adjacent receiving water bodies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NPDES permit is required from State Water Resources Control Board for water discharges into Department right-of-way. ▪ BMPs should be mentioned, e.g., construction site BMPs, Design Pollution Prevention BMPs, and Treatment BMPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ California Department of Transportation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should describe known areas that will be converted from farmland to another use – project could affect several thousand acres of farmland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Describe type, amount, and location of affected farmlands. ○ Evaluate impacts to contract, Farmland Security Zone, and agricultural preserve lands by acreage and prime or non-prime land. ○ Make use of Department’s Important Farmland and Williamson Act maps, Department’s Land Evaluation Site Assessment (LESA) model. ○ Discuss conflicts with Williamson Act contracts. ○ Review indirect impacts on agricultural operations, e.g., land use conflicts, land value and tax increases. ○ Review growth inducing impacts. ○ Evaluate cumulative impacts. ▪ Encourage use of agricultural conservation easements for mitigation, through outright purchase or donation of mitigation fees. Note that Department has 30 other ‘conservation tools.’ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns regarding irreversible damage to natural, cultural, and scenic resources of State Park System (SPS) – at least 10 SPS units have potential to be affected. Should address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Impacts to landscape-level features – e.g., important recreation areas and viewsheds, regional recreational trail corridors, key watersheds, wildlife habitat and corridors, cultural landscapes and sacred sites, significant geological features and paleontological resources. ○ Impacts to sensitive and special-status resources. ▪ Alignment may still adversely affect Henry W. Coe State Park and others, e.g., McConnel and San Luis Reservoir State Recreation Areas. ▪ Consider the following during planning and preparation of Program EIR/EIS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPS Unit Classification, General Plans, planning efforts. ○ Multifaceted recreation – e.g., natural resources, cultural features, noise level and visual stimuli consistent with park setting. ○ Visual and aesthetic resources, e.g., effects of noise/vibration. Screening distances should be greater than 900 feet particularly for parklands. Mitigation should include pre- and post-project noise and vibration monitoring. ○ Natural resources – sustainable function of ecosystems and special-status resources. HST mountain crossing likely to impact biological, geological and soil, paleontological, hydrologic, and water and air quality values on large scale, therefore affecting SPS units. Alternatives should avoid other critical publicly and privately protected conservation lands to avoid habitat fragmentation and degradation. ▪ Consider following impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Loss of habitat, e.g., from construction staging areas, permanent facilities. ○ Construction impacts, e.g., tunnel access roads, earthmoving activities, exotic and invasive species, compacted soils, erosion, sedimentation, and hazardous materials. ○ Transection of riparian areas, wetlands, and impacts to related wildlife, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ California Department of Parks and Recreation

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disruption of regional wildlife movements. ○ Impacts of noise/vibration and ongoing HST movements on small mammals, ground nesting birds, and other wildlife activity. ○ Air/dust pollution from construction and power plants needed for HST power generation. ○ Light pollution. ○ Electromagnetic fields on wildlife movements. ○ Collision by and electrocution of avian species with electrical wires. ○ Impacts on unique and aesthetically beautiful geological formations. ○ Impacts to paleontological resources. ○ Cultural resources – construction of HST will likely result in infrastructure consolidation, new facility and local transmission line development and maintenance along the alignment leading to likely disturbance of archeological resources, historic structures, cultural landscapes, sacred sites. Vibration could affect historic structures. Archeological sites should be avoided. ▪ Overall should avoid direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the California SPS. Authority and FRA should make particular efforts to consult with the Department. 	
REGIONAL AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BCDC is responsible for granting or denying permits for Bay filling or dredging and shoreline development within BCDC jurisdiction (100 feet inland). ▪ BCDC Bay Area Plan includes land use designations to ensure that sufficient area is reserved for water-oriented uses (e.g., ports, water-related industry, parks, wildlife areas, tidal marshes, salt ponds, managed wetlands). ▪ NOP contains alignments within BCDC jurisdiction and that avoid the Bay – should contact BCDC early to avoid and mitigate impacts. ▪ Where new infrastructure to be developed or existing infrastructure expanded, alignments should be sited/designed to avoid adverse affects on Bay resources (e.g., tidal marshes, tidal flats, restored areas, habitats that support endangered species) and BCDC priority uses (e.g., waterfront park, beach, wildlife refuge) -- Infrastructure should be designed to minimize fill. ▪ Design and siting should incorporate non-motorized public access and preserve and enhance visual. ▪ A bridge is a water-oriented use that can be approved by the Commission (under McAteer-Petris Act) if there is not an alternative upland location for the route and if the fill is the minimum necessary to achieve the purposes of the project. ▪ Bay Plan includes two applicable policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy 3 states that there must be an adequate analysis to determine that there is no upland alternative for the route, and ○ Policy 4 provides guidelines for constructing and designing a bridge over the Bay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Districts, together with adjacent federal wildlife refuges, state wildlife areas and state parklands make up Grasslands Ecological Area (GEA). – Map of area provided as attachment. ▪ Encompasses approximately 180,000 acres and is largest wetland complex in California – largest block of contiguous wetlands in Central Valley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grassland Water District and Grassland Resource Conservation District

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bisection of the GEA by HST may interfere with critical wildlife corridors, disrupt canals and waterways, degrade water quality, interfere with waterfowl nesting and breeding, and increase wildlife mortality rates due to noise, shock and collision impacts. ▪ Urge HST alignment avoid crossing or otherwise fragmenting the GEA, or, at a minimum, assure that no decision on the alignment be made until potential impacts on the GEA are thoroughly examined. ▪ Provide description of the importance of the GEA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ \$28 million invested in conservation easements for over 64,000 acres. ○ USFWS proposes to expand by 45,000 acres. ○ Preserves variety of habitats. ○ Estimated that 30% of migratory population of waterfowl uses this area for winter foraging. ○ Over a million waterfowl regularly found in GEA during winter months. ○ GEA recognized as "Wetland of Worldwide Importance" by Ramsar Convention. ○ Provides area flood control, educational, and recreational opportunities, with 300,000 users per year for hunting, fishing, and non-consumptive wildlife recreation, contributing \$41 million per year to Merced County economy representing 800 jobs. ▪ Need to comply with CEQA requirements, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Description of setting, including full description of GEA. ○ Description of the project, including key project features, that enables an evaluation and review of environmental impacts, including significant construction, engineering, and operational impacts. ○ Identification and analysis of all direct and indirect potentially significant impacts, including potential biological impacts on GEA wildlife and habitat. ○ Identification of feasible mitigation measures. ▪ Potential impacts include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interference with Wildlife Corridors including significant fragmentation. ○ Disruption of canals and waterways, e.g., Santa Fe and San Luis Canals, Mud Slough South and Porter-Blake Bypass. ○ Interference with access to hunting clubs. ○ Noise and vibration. ○ HST shock wave. ○ Wildlife collisions with trains. ○ Construction impacts ○ Water flow and water quality. ▪ Section 4(f) requirements apply, i.e., must show that: (1) there are no feasible and prudent alternatives and that (2) all planning has occurred to minimize harm. ▪ Executive Order 11990 requirements apply, i.e., need to avoid new construction in wetlands unless: (1) no practicable alternative exists, and (2) project includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands. ▪ Even though a program document, may not defer until later a full analysis of potential environmental impacts, and may not defer development of mitigation measures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wildlife underpasses, bridges, and large culverts could be considered, but evidence must be provided for the success of any proposed mitigation. 	

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must adequately analyze cumulative impacts, e.g., aligning rail project along Henry Miller Road and thus further fragmenting the GEA. EIR/S must include a reasonable range of alternatives. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should compare environmental impacts of use of existing rail corridors versus new rail corridors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIS/EIR should address impacts to following parks, preserves, and recreation areas within northern Alameda County: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> De Valle State Recreation Area, Mission Peak Regional Preserve, Vargas Plateau Regional Preserve, Pleasanton Ridge Regional Park, Brushy Peak Regional Preserve, Shadow Cliffs Regional Recreation Area, Dry Creek/Pioneer Regional Park, Quarry Lakes Regional Recreation Area, Ardenwood Preserve, Coyote Hills Regional Park CA Dept. of Fish and Game Eden Landing Ecological Preserve and Don Edwards Fish and Wildlife Refuge. Impacts to following trails should be addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alameda Creek Trail, Niles Canyon Trail, Bay Area Ridge Trail, San Francisco Bay Trail, Iron Horse Trail, Niles Canyon to Shadow Cliffs Trail, San Joaquin County to Shadow Cliffs Trail, Shadow Cliffs to Morgan Territory Trail, Tassajara Creek Trail. Section 4(f) alternatives section should be included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> East Bay Regional Park District
COUNTY AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to address Santa Clara County Parks and parklands located in vicinity of HST project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parklands contain sensitive and protected species and habitats. Should consider planned regional trail routes. Note the existence of multi-agency fisheries management plans for Coyote Creek, Stevens Creek, and Guadalupe River. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have jurisdiction and permitting authority over streams and watercourses in Santa Clara County. Are interested in any alignment crossing streams or water courses and impacts to 100 year flood areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Santa Clara Valley Water District
CITIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have concerns regarding impacts from Castro Street grade separation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business impacts. Blocked access. Property acquisitions, business and residential relocations, demolition of structures. Impacts to new transit center. Have concerns regarding Rengstorff Ave. grade separation, including property acquisitions, business and residential relocations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Mountain View
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should explore routes or methods to avoid significant adverse impacts to Peninsula area. More detail is needed in analysis (compared to level of detail in statewide Program EIR/EIS). Need to explain "Slight Elevated and Slight Depressed" legend on maps for Menlo Park. Grade separation and four tracks through the City would require relocation of an historic structure. Right-of-way requirements need to be defined. HST system in Caltrain corridor would preclude or limit ability of Caltrain to expand its services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Menlo Park

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts on Menlo Park residents needs to be addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HST generated noise, particularly given the proposed frequency of HS trains. ○ Loss of trees. ○ Impacts to view corridors. ○ Economic impacts to nearby property owners. ○ Local traffic circulation. ▪ Concern regarding overhead electric power, including wire supporting poles, mast arms, etc. – should refer to City comments on Caltrain Electrification environmental document. 	
PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS & ASSOCIATIONS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction and operation of HST would significantly and detrimentally impact natural resources, including ecoregions, portfolio conservation areas, and conservation target species. ▪ Use best available information regarding impacts to unique biological resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliance on California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) is insufficient. ○ Consider Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSHCP). ▪ Evaluate alternatives in a comprehensive and consistent basis. ▪ Quantify percent of suitable habitat that is lost, fragmented and degraded at a minimum. ▪ Conservancy's Mount Hamilton project would be irreparably damaged. ▪ Grasslands Ecological Area (GEA) is a priority conservation area with significant public investment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pacheco Pass Alignment bisects GEA and would have tremendous negative consequences on biological diversity. ▪ Noise, vibration and light will adversely affect wildlife habitat quality. ▪ HST could introduce non-native, invasive species. ▪ Construction activities could be more adverse than HST operations. ▪ For tunneling, consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of water and effects on water quality. ○ Tunnel effects on groundwater flow. ○ Disposal of removed materials - impacts on biological resources. ○ Impacts of pre-excavation investigations. ▪ Aerial structures have been cited as way to mitigate impacts, e.g., to aquatic systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Impacts from aerial structures construction need to be evaluated. ▪ Need to consider impacts from system maintenance, e.g., access roads, and vegetation management (use of herbicides). ▪ Cumulative impacts need to be assessed, including direct and indirect effects, i.e., on biological resources by a HST alignment through the Diablo Range. Cumulative impacts from growth inducement need to be evaluated, e.g., growth in Central Valley. ▪ Need to identify feasible mitigation measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overpasses and tunneling may prove to be infeasible. ○ Mitigation costs need to be included, e.g., for wetland mitigation and construction of wildlife underpasses and overpasses. ▪ Look at net benefit mitigation measures, e.g., opportunities for project to improve wildlife connectivity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nature Conservancy

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have concerns regarding alignment through Isabel and San Antonio Valleys, just north of Coe Park, that are essential part of regional eco-system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cuts (up to 200 feet) and fill (as high as 160 feet) would form permanent and ugly barrier across heart of the Mt. Hamilton, severing wildlife corridors and scaring remote landscapes. ▪ HSR Authority should reject Northern Crossing that does not follow existing transportation Corridor. Recommend Pacheco Pass alignment as least environmentally damaging that will also assure long term economic success of HST system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advocates for Coe Park
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have concerns with HST system impacts to protected landscapes (parks, open space, wildlife refuges), e.g., Nature Conservancy's Mount Hamilton project. ▪ HSR Authority should give higher priority to protecting 4(f) and 6(f) resources. ▪ Study area contains many landscapes that should be avoided: Don Edwards National Wildlife Area, Grasslands Ecological Area, Anderson Lake, George Hatfield State Recreation Area, San Luis State Recreation Area, Cottonwood Creek wildlife Area, Los Banos Wildlife Area, Ohlone Regional Wilderness, Sunol Regional Wilderness, and Pacheco State Park. ▪ Section 4(f) does not address private conservation groups such as Nature Conservancy or local land trusts, but these lands should be protected. ▪ Growth inducement will create pressures on protected landscapes – HSR system should use existing transportation corridors such as Altamont to minimize impacts on induced development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Defense of Place
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Must discuss relative quality and importance of habitat to be destroyed in relation to overall survival of applicable species. ▪ Identification and analysis of habitat cannot be limited solely to California Natural Diversity Database (CNNB). Identification and analysis of wetlands cannot be limited to National Wetlands Inventory (NWI). ▪ Roads are one of top causes of species imperilment. Railroads, as linear transportation features, are assumed to be similar. Impacts are mortality from construction, road kill, habitat fragmentation, alteration of movement and behavior, spread of exotic species, spread of human activity, reduction of environmental quality, and facilitation of sprawl. ▪ Must explicitly list and discuss the advantages of railway corridors over highways. ▪ Must analyze impacts of habitat fragmentation and wildlife movement corridors. <i>Missing Linkages</i> report and associated GIS overlays identify major areas of movement throughout state, but every mile of rail has potential to fragment habitat. Habitat fragmentation is important to functioning of ecological processes, e.g., pollination. ▪ Must analyze impacts to proposed and final federally designated critical habitat. ▪ Should place special emphasis on such wide-ranging species as mountain lions, coyotes, bobcats, and bears – for example, taller fences are needed for mountain lions. ▪ Must analyze impacts from invasion of non-native species along alignments. ▪ Must analyze impacts on wildlife from noise, vibration, lighting, EMF and EMI. ▪ Railways cause bird mortalities through collision with trains, overhead cable, and electrocution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Defense of Wildlife

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Must demonstrate and assess consistency with federally threatened and endangered recovery plan goals, e.g., as contained in recovery plans for San Joaquin kit fox, desert tortoise, Bay checkerspot butterfly, delta smelt, California red-legged frog, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, California condor, marbled murrelet, giant kangaroo rat, Fresno kangaroo rat, short-nosed kangaroo rat, Tipton kangaroo rat, San Joaquin Valley riparian woodrat, arroyo toad, Pacific pocket mouse, Riverside fairy shrimp, and San Diego fairy shrimp. Additional plans are being developed. ▪ Literature on impacts of roads on ecological systems should be considered. ▪ Must assess impacts to conservation lands and planning areas. ▪ Must assess economic costs of wildlife impacts. ▪ Must analyze impacts on vernal pools/wetlands – must go beyond NWI. ▪ Central Valley grasslands are highly threatened ecosystem from invasive, annual grasses and threats from urban and suburban development and changing agricultural practices. ▪ Must assess impacts in terms of quality of habitat that will be impacted and how this affects the ability of species to survive. ▪ Grasslands Ecological Area (GEA) is of particular concern – 160,000-acre area in Merced County. ▪ Growth inducing impacts of stations in Los Banos, Merced, and Gilroy will be enormous for GEA and must be analyzed – therefore suggest no stations at these locations. ▪ California Burrowing Owl is species of special concern and is known to occur throughout the entire alignment – owl prefers to nest near roads and artificially raised areas (berms/levees). ▪ Various traits and characteristics should be provided for each impacted species. ▪ Spatial area analyses of species and habitat within a specified distance of each potential alignment must be considered for all impacts, especially fragmentation and wildlife movement corridor impacts. ▪ Additional alignment-specific information is provided in comment letter for the San Joaquin Kit Fox, wildlife movement corridors, and critical habitat impacted. ▪ Must discuss use and adequacy of overpasses and underpasses to facilitate species movement. ▪ Mitigation measures are suggested for consideration, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Speed of operation. ○ Preference to construct rail lines along existing roads only. ○ Installation of wildlife warning devices. ○ Reduced train speeds in wildlife area. ○ Carcass removal to decrease attraction for carnivores and scavengers. ○ Cleanup of any spilled grain or food attractants. ○ Reduction in vegetation that is attractive to wildlife. ○ Minimization of fragmentation and maximizing the ratio of areas of fragments. ○ Narrowing of travel corridors. ○ Insulation of catenary suspension wire. ○ Oversizing of insulators to discourage perching birds. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise impacts of current Caltrain operations, particularly near engine idling locations, must be characterized to quantify impact (+ or -) of electrification and grade separations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Heritage District Neighborhood Assoc., Sunnyvale

Protection of the Environment – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would grade separations and electrification reduce noise that neighborhood is experiencing? ▪ FTA noise guidelines are currently not being followed, and sooty deposits due to Caltrain are present in neighborhood. ▪ Prior EIR mistakenly indicated that elevated alignment is an option at Mathilda. There is insufficient room for a third track. 	
INDIVIDUALS/PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Diablo Range Direct Alternative will adversely affect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Indian artifacts. ○ Wildlife and habitat, including habitat fragmentation. ○ Groundwater and surface waters. ○ Visual environment. ▪ Diablo Range Direct Alternative will introduce adverse noise impacts, e.g., to wildlife. ▪ Diablo Range Direct Alternative will introduce growth inducement issues by creating a new corridor through the wilderness area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ranch owners along Diablo Range Direct alignment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Family co-owns Isabel Valley Ranch that would be substantially impacted by proposed Diablo Direct alignment. Valley is pristine wilderness with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Abundant wildlife including many endangered/protected species (bald eagle, mountain lions, tule elk, antelope, etc. ○ Ancient Native American campsites/villages. ○ Underground aquifers. ▪ HST alignment would be a “major abomination.” Would ruin natural state of the wilderness. Impacts would be difficult, if not impossible to mitigate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Richard McDonald
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How many faults will the HST system need to cross? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wetlands are important to accommodate. ▪ Conservative construction practices need top priority. Invasive vegetation is difficult and expensive to manage (pesticide issues) ▪ Strive to encourage agricultural vistas rather than just dense urban development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Important to minimize noise, visual, and environmental (natural) impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card

TOPIC 2: ALIGNMENT AND STATION ALTERNATIVES

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
FEDERAL AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EPA supports FRA and SHSRA commitment to analyze full range of alternatives to ensure that alignment carried forward for project-level study is most likely to contain the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA). ▪ EPA would have difficulty concurring on a Diablo Direct alignment as the LEDPA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports HST system. ▪ Altamont alignment is unacceptable and not practicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would not provide full service options to San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland. ○ Is incapable of providing service that meets basic project purpose. ○ Would not generate satisfactory revenues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Congresswoman Zoe Lofgren and Congressman Michael Honda

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Altamont alignment would require construction of new Bay crossing, adding to project costs and causing environmental impacts (degradation of aquatic resources and impacts to established communities). Without Bay crossing, Altamont alignment would serve only two termini – Oakland and San Jose, with no service to San Francisco, SFO International Airport, or locations along Peninsula. Routing to San Jose and then San Francisco would be impracticable, causing increased travel time. 	
REGIONAL AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports selection of Pacheco Pass alignment. Supports use of Caltrain right-of-way for CA HST system. Endorses Guiding Principles of the Silicon Valley High-Speed Rail Coalition. Conditioned upon adherence to an additional principle that design, construction, and operation of HST service will be “fully consistent with the goals and operational requirements associated with Caltrain and with the values of the cities on the Peninsula through which the system would be constructed and operated.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to assure HST system goes to the Transbay Terminal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transbay Joint Powers Authority representative speaking at scoping meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly supports Pacheco Pass Alignment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides direct mainline service to Silicon Valley Area and San Jose. Would follow existing transportation corridor. Would minimize adverse environmental impacts. Would not pass through or under Henry Coe Park. Efficiently serve three Bay Area demand centers – San Jose, San Francisco, Oakland. Would alleviate capacity constraints on BART system. Altamont Pass alignment would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require building a new bridge or tunnel across San Francisco Bay. Rely heavily on BART, exacerbating capacity constraints. Supports running HST along Caltrain Corridor as much as feasible. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would have reduced costs. Would reinforce existing rail service between Gilroy and San Francisco by increasing speed, frequency, and safety of Caltrain service. Opposes turning HST service into a commuter line serving the Central Valley and Bay Area. Supports expanding existing commuter rail service such as ACE and Capital Corridor instead. Need to look at operation cost efficiencies of alignment options, e.g., system efficiency, maintenance facilities and vehicle requirements. Consider impacts of growth inducement in Tracy and San Joaquin County, e.g., demands on infrastructure and impacts to agricultural lands. Altamont alignment would require stations in Livermore and/or Pleasanton. Need to evaluate impacts of such stations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the Altamont Pass. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> San Joaquin County Council of Governments

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Merced COG supports Pacheco pass. I would like MTC to consider Merced (even though out of 9 county area). People are selling their homes to move to less expensive area, which is happening in Merced (Stockton, Modesto moving to Merced). Twenty-five percent of our work force going to nine county bay area. Wanted to bring this to your attention for more consideration in MTC plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Merced COG representative at scoping meeting
COUNTIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HST system needs to obtain its own rights-of-way or easements for alignments or portions thereof in San Joaquin County. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> San Joaquin County, Public Works Dept.
CITIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We in Union City are looking forward to the day that HSR comes to Union City and there needs to be a stop in San Francisco,, Oakland, and San Jose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mark Green mayor of Union City.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider HST multi-modal station in City of Livermore (at Greenville BART station site) as alternative to City of Pleasanton HST station: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for continued employment growth in Livermore. City supports high density residential development adjacent to transit corridor (e.g., ACE train stations and planned BART stations). Greenville station would include BART, ACE, and Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority bus service and over 3,000 high density housing units plus office and commercial development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Livermore
PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS & ASSOCIATIONS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> San Mateo and Redwood City Chambers of Commerce support Pacheco Pass alignment – and support the guiding principles of the Silicon Valley High Speed Rail Coalition. Please continue to consider Redwood City as a HSR stop. Menlo Park is considering the alignment issue but has yet to take a position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports studying HSR alignment through Altamont Pass to San Francisco, and to San Jose via Milpitas, Montague Expressway/Trimble Road and Mineta San Jose Airport (as proposed by Michael Kiesling). Ridership and revenue analysis should assess: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential commute ridership for the Altamont Commuter Express service if it shares HST alignment – ACE is evaluating use of FRA non-compliant rail car equipment. Model two scenarios: (1) ACE continues to provide local service, and (2) ACE provides no service but HSR provides approximately half hour service. Ridership with BART extended to Livermore with a shared station with HSR and with BART extended to San Jose under current the VTA proposal with a shared station at Irvington in Fremont. Ridership with BART extended to Livermore with a shared station with HSR and with BART extended only as far as a new Fremont station (shared with HSR). Should examine Altamont alignment in terms of future HST cost and construction timelines of building HST to Sacramento from the Bay Area, and compare this with the Pacheco Pass alternative. Should examine Altamont alignment on HST travel times to Sacramento from San Francisco and San Jose and compare with the Pacheco Pass alternative. Should examine the number of train-car loads per hour needed to transport the total projected passenger demand between San Francisco and Los Angeles, and between San Jose and Los Angeles for five year intervals to 2050 under the two scenarios (Altamont vs. Pacheco). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BayRail Alliance

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should examine the number of traincar-miles-day that would be required of trains from Los Angeles if all HSR trains enter the Bay Area using Altamont Pass and are decoupled in Fremont with train segment to San Jose and one train segment to San Francisco ▪ Should examine the traincar-miles-day required of trains from Los Angeles using Altamont with some trains proceeding to San Jose and some to San Francisco, and compare with Pacheco Pass Alternative. ▪ Should identify operating and maintenance costs and capital costs for above alternatives. ▪ Should evaluate the number of tracks along all portions of the rail line between San Francisco and San Jose that would be required if Pacheco Pass is used to bring HSR into Bay area. Should evaluate under two scenarios: (a) Caltrain using FRA-compliant trains, and (b) Caltrain converted to use of non-FRA compliant trains that can run on same tracks as HSR. ▪ Should identify the number of HSR trains each day that would be passing through each station on the peninsula between San Francisco and San Jose for the above alternatives, along with the energy demands and the attendant noise levels along the corridors. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider use of the HST portion and lower speed local portions of the plan drawn by Architecture 21, available at http://www.arch21.org/BARegRail.dir/regrailindex.html <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Map is provided and was shown on one of the display boards at the scoping meetings. ▪ Assume all-day ACE service shares HST tracks to San Jose using same trainsets as HST to be compatible. Trains would stop at HST stations and local stations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Service would be an upgrade of the currently planned BART extension to San Jose, and would replace it. ○ Build local stations with three or four tracks as needed for HST to pass safely ▪ Count ship traffic passing through Dumbarton rail bridge. Review trends to determine whether more ship traffic is likely in the future, and then determine whether a low bridge would suffice if it swings open only a few times a year. Use this analysis to determine whether a low bridge or a replacement bridge is appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports study of Pacheco Pass alignment and other alternatives that do not pass through Henry W. Coe State Park or through the Isabel and San Antonio Valleys just north of Coe Park. ▪ Believe that the Authority's earlier decision to reject Altamont Pass – after thorough consideration – was correct. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not viable for operational reasons alone – would require a three-way split to serve Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose. ○ Would require trains to pass San Jose and then turn south (from Modesto) to reach Silicon Valley, increasing travel times between San Jose and Southern California by up to 35 minutes. ○ Does not maximize frequency to one of the largest population centers in the region and would not maximizing economic viability of the HST system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Silicon Valley Leadership Group

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly supports Pacheco Pass alignment and variations. Should eliminate from consideration alignments that bisect Isabel and San Antonio Valleys, just north of Coe Park, given the significant negative impacts on sensitive wildlife corridors in this remote region of the Mount Hamilton Range. Oppose Altamont Pass alignment. Environmental and operational reasons for Authority's previous rejection of this alignment were sound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Silicon Valley High Speed Rail Coalition²
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If northerly HST Bay Area access is chosen, should incorporate 125 mph commuter rail service. Should define segments carefully for cost estimating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southern alignment segment should extend from Chowchilla to Redwood City. Northern alignment segment should extend from Manteca to Redwood City and from Fremont to San Jose. The cost of the Chowchilla to Manteca section should be excluded from the cost of the northern alignment because this segment will have to be constructed in any event to serve Sacramento. It is essential that HST services be developed within the regional framework, meaning that certain sections should be both 125 mph+ commuter rail service and HST service operating within the same HST right-of-way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Train Riders Association of California
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to serve transit orienting development (TOD) that is already in place or in the pipeline. Don't need a promise of TOD, but the actual thing. There has to be some kind of a quid pro quo between station and TOD. A lot of urban parking lots are already filled up. People can't park and there is no bus to get you there. A lot of work to be done to improve access to stations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment from Train Riders Associate of California (TRAC) representative at scoping meeting
INDIVIDUALS/ PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSR must serve downtown San Francisco. Transbay Transit Center is being designed to accommodate HSR and will provide key connectivity of the region. San Francisco will continue to be the center of the Bay Area, and a more significant destination in the State than Oakland or San Jose. Don't shoot HSR in the foot by not having it come to San Francisco. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximize potential for service (including future expansion) to San Francisco as the primary destination for business, leisure, and long-distance commuters. Most cost-effective and shortest trip-time should be selected. Minimize impacts to the natural environment and protected resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card

² Includes Congressman Mike Honda, Congressman Zoe Lofgren, State Senator Elaine Alquist, State Senator Ahel Maldonado, Assembly Member Simon Selinas, Assembly Member Rebecca Cohn, Assembly Member Joe Coto, Advocates for Coe Park, Applied Materials, Associated General Contractors of CA., Building and Construction Trades Council of San Mateo County, Cal Apartment Association (Tri-County Division), Caltrain, CELSOC – Santa Clara County Chapter, City of San Jose, City of Santa Clara, City of Sunnyvale, Coherent, Inc., Gilroy Chamber of Commerce, Dianne McKenna, Peninsula Open Space Trust and former member of CTC, Operating Engineers, Local Union No. 3, Pine Ridge Assoc., Sally Probst, Redwood City/San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce, SAMCEDA, San Jose Downtown Assoc., San Jose Convention & Visitors Bureau, Santa Clara and San Benito Counties Building and Construction Trades Council, Santa Clara County, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, Solectron Corp, Town Of Los Gatos

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If HST objective is to provide transportation choice, reduce congestion, prevent urban Sprawl, protect natural resources and agricultural land, then strongly oppose Pacheco Pass and North of State Park or South of Gilroy as they would promote urban sprawl. ▪ Should study in detail how to maximize Altamont pass. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Son-Cheong Kuan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Altamont Pass alignment appears preferable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Allows existing Central Valley commuters to take part in HST project, providing solid base of riders and financial revenue stream. ○ Valley is fastest growing portion of California. Growing communities (e.g., Mountain House, Tracy, Stockton, Mantica, and Modesto) need to be adequately connected to employment centers. ○ Should allow seamless connection to BART 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Joel Buchingham
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include Modesto and all future growing communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support Altamont Pass alignment. Is more efficient if since Oakland-bound branch can be served by effective connection to BART in Fremont. East Bay demand can be satisfied with BART. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HST alignment should incorporate fast growing areas of the Central Valley like Mountain House, Tracy, Mantica, and similar communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Choose Altamont Pass to maximize the commuter ridership and reduce environmental impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Altamont Pass is best gateway to Central Valley for HSR, with branches to San Jose and San Francisco. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider Altamont Pass alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Altamont pass preferred over Pacheco alignment. ▪ Would like for Livermore to have a HSR stop. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Altamont pass is preferred alignment. South Bay already has Caltrain. ▪ If HSR comes to Livermore, OK, but it should not replace BART. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Study area should be expanded to include Fresno HST Station to allow review of UPRR/99 alignment, given that BNSF is too far east and making the Chowchilla connection for Pacheco Pass alignment longer than needed. ▪ Alignment west of 99 should be reexamined from Merced to Manteca to minimize length of connection to Altamont option. ▪ Should consider conversion of BART Dublin line to HST, providing much shorter route to Oakland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Michael Kiesling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of Pacheco pass. Diablo Direct is in pristine wildness area, with mountain lions, etc. Any disruption would be an absolute crime. Native American campsites need to be preserved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider Altamont Alternative that goes first to San Jose and then to San Francisco. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Must include San Jose stop. ▪ Don't compete with existing service (e.g., ACE, Caltrain) ▪ Must be convenient to use from major population base areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Follow highest population entry point into Bay Area, i.e., Livermore. ▪ Acquire right-of-way as soon as possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the development that's already in place. Choice of site is important. Coming up the peninsula is not right because of established communities. HSR from Los Angeles to San Jose to San Francisco is okay, but we need to focus on quality of life now in the communities between these major cities. Maybe HSR needs to go to where there is not a large community, e.g.. U.S. 101 or I-280. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker from Atherton
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus attention on major urban centers. It's a "no brainer" that HSR should go from San Jose to San Francisco, if your objective is to minimize the rail time between large cites. Need to put your major assets into major areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pick alignment that serves three major centers – San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland with equal service. Let existing rail services get local trips to these hubs. Don't build too many HSR stations. Alignment needs to be fast. Don't build so many stations in Central Valley unless they can demonstrate and use planning can justify appropriate densities around HSR stations and local service. Increase local service in the Central Valley and let this service collect passengers for a few HSR stations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place stations few and far between but well connected to other transportation modes. Put stations near international airports as well as Central Valley feeder airports in Fresno, Modesto, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSR system should connect to Los Angeles, San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland, with hubs in the Central Valley cities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look at shortest travel times for Bay Area to Southern California. Consider shared infrastructure with commuter corridor rail Provide accessibility to greatest number of riders. Do it right – not just cheaply. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be successful, must be competitive with air travel and siphon off some of that traffic – provide service to major centers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about environmental impacts along Pacheco pass. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Altamont Pass alignment is off base – Pacheco Pass is far superior: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less tunneling through southern mountains. No new bridge over the San Francisco Bay – now seeing how expensive cost overruns can be for the Bay Bridge and new Carquinez Bridge. New bridge might harm valuable marsh land. Follows existing rail corridor from Gilroy to San Francisco. Is a more direct route into Bay Area from Central Valley/Southern California. Altamont alignment is commuter proposal for Bay Area workers who have chosen to live 1-2 hours away in the Central Valley and who already have ACE train, limited access highways (580 / 680), and BART into eastern Alameda County. Connection to Central Valley from San Jose is two-lane road – Route 152. As third largest city in the State, San Jose should be on the main HST line. Why should smaller towns like Tracy and Livermore be on the main line? HST designed and intended to provide alternative transportation between southern and Northern California. Pacheco Pass alignment is superior. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anthony Dominguez

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> San Jose needs to be a stop on the main line. Pacheco Pass makes more sense than the Mt. Hamilton Range alignment. Would serve Monterey and San Benito Counties as well as southern Santa Clara County. Altamont Pass routes needs to be upgraded to better serve commuter rail to Pleasanton BART, San Jose, and Oakland – Not HSR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not go over Mt. Hamilton. Use existing rights-of-way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Livermore needs to be hub or on other side towards Tracy and Modesto – with ACE, HSR and BART coming together – going out from hub to other regions. Passengers could pick which trains based on where they want to go. The problem is that congestion begins at 5 and 205. Relieve congestion elsewhere and it will relieve it here. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefers some version of Altamont Pass alignment to serve large existing population concentrations in the Dublin/Pleasanton/Livermore areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make connection into Livermore Valley – not south to San Jose – so that traffic congestion from the Central Valley on I-580 can be alleviated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If in Livermore Valley, connect with ACE and BART. Proposed Greenwood Road station might be better location for this connection. Can the Capitol Corridor between Oakland and Sacramento be upgraded to carry high-speed service? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary function of trunk line HST system should be connection between regions, not (primarily) within regions, which is best served by directly connecting primary centers – San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, San Diego. Northern route (Altamont) would make San Jose a spur line to serve several suburban communities already served by ACE. This would be a mistake. Should use southern connection with direct service to San Jose. Environmental costs of southern route are outweighed by creation of a more successful rail HST system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> John Beutler
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider ridership from commuters when reviewing Altamont alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should design HSR to accommodate intercity and commuter rail. Need to think in terms of regional and interregional rail network and grid to reflect current and future land use patterns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you know the travel time difference using Altamont from San Francisco to Los Angeles vs. Pacheco pass? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports HST, Pacheco Pass alignment, and shared use of Caltrain Corridor. Alignment between Los Angeles and Bay area should provide minimum travel times for employees utilizing this travel mode, which is important for the success of HST system. Supports continued consideration of HST station in Redwood City. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jim Bigelow
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should evaluate HST to San Francisco Airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximize speed relationship to flight times. Link car and connecting transit to alignment – transit oriented development (TOD), car rentals, pickup, and park-and-ride. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to compete with air travel. Every minute of travel time increases that advantage. Prefer the shortest route between San Francisco and Los Angeles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider expected passenger base. Most profitable customers are business travelers (from Los Angeles and elsewhere), who aren't likely to be interested in visiting the East Bay but rather downtown San Francisco and Silicon Valley. Alignment must include the South Bay (Pacheco Pass) rather than Altamont. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pacheco Pass is good option if BART is built to Livermore. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rather than Diablo Range Alternative, consider tunneling under entire Diablo Range from Central Valley to Santa Clara Valley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranch owners along Diablo Range Direct alignment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family co-owns Isabel Valley Ranch that would be substantially impacted by proposed Diablo Direct alignment. Urge adoption of Pacheco Pass alignment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Richard McDonald
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider putting HSR out toward U.S. 101. It's a more industrialized, commercial area and not as residential as the Caltrain corridor along the Peninsula. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of community impact, if HSR came up Peninsula, would rather see it underground or at least in a cut. HSR stops are in major cities and at airports. Proposal is possibly one Peninsula stop. If someone on Peninsula wants to get to Los Angeles, they would start at Redwood City, for example, down to San Jose, where they would start going fast to Los Angeles. Caltrain is already there. If San Francisco and San Jose are connected to HSR, it could go anywhere. I like I-280. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSR from Los Angeles to San Jose to San Francisco is okay, but need to focus on quality of life in the communities between these major cities. Coming up the Peninsula is not right because of established communities. HSR needs to go to where there are not developed communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early envisioning of HSR was to deal with extensive air congestion, and also allowed for elimination of feeder line flights to Airports. Therefore must get to SFO, because whole point to alleviate the air congestion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct service to San Francisco is important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Destination into San Francisco Transbay Terminal is too expensive. Destination from Los Angeles or Modesto should be into Oakland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of Altamont study, re-evaluate San Jose and Oakland connections. There are three rail alignments between San Jose and Oakland. All should be studied. There is no need for HSR service to Oakland with adequate BART service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which alignment allows the most efficient way to San Francisco? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that HST plans in Caltrain Corridor will curtail Caltrain's current service and its ability to expand service, particularly if HST system takes enough Caltrain right-of-way for two tracks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constitutes a significant cumulative impact. Would significantly impact economic vitality of Peninsula and Silicon Valley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Louis B. Deziel, Jr.

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unrealistic for HST system to operate separate control system independent of Caltrain along the Peninsula – recommends Caltrain control all trains. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HSR stations need to be located in city centers so that they don't encourage suburban growth. ▪ Prefer Southern alignment with San Jose on main line, splitting to Oakland and San Francisco. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sacramento will be the winner/loser for the Pacheco vs. Altamont decision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HST route from the Bay Area to joint the route to Sacramento should disturb the least amount of open space, stop at the optimum number of communities, and enhance ridership but not delay the trip unduly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should create separate publicly-owned rail corridor for HST system. ▪ Use "livable cities" concept for HST alignment decisions and for pedestrian station locations. ▪ Altamont would be the least-fought, best placed, least-cost scenario. ▪ Should do project as California only or team with Oregon or Nevada. Las Vegas loves California wallets. ▪ For 50 years into the future, also consider Washington State for West Coast States' Corridor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Michael Brennan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should condition funding for stations on adoption of General Plans (in station area cities) that designate high minimum density thresholds for jobs and housing within one mile of station areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build Transit Oriented Development around HST stations to assist with affordable housing. Consider new communities around HST Stations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A lot that can be done with infill projects – relatively inexpensive but provide more transit riders quickly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggest either Altamont Pass or Northern Tunnel. ▪ Would AMTAK San Joaquin stop service? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bob Barzan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider Altamont Pass / ACE route, Dumbarton Rail Bridge, Capital Corridor, and Union Pacific existing rail line (Alviso) through San Jose Airport ▪ No BART to San Jose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should connect Stockton. ▪ Identify tunneling cost savings – more tunneling can occur. ▪ Identify partnerships with airlines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that the regional interest in high-speed commuter rail will overshadow the statewide issues of the Bay Area. ▪ Maintain the two hour schedule between San Jose and Los Angeles (Union Station) to maximize revenues. ▪ Provide schedule feeders at both ends, e.g. all trains from Los Angeles will have a timed transfer to both of the Bay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upgrading of Caltrain Peninsula corridor (for higher speeds and electrification) would benefit both long-distance HSR riders and Caltrain commuters. ▪ Supports Altamont Pass Alignment that would also benefit long-distance HSR riders and ACE commuters. ▪ Should review use of Dumbarton line by HSR ▪ Should also consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Connection from San Francisco to Oakland to Sacramento – would allow replacement of Capital Corridor service that has grown substantially. ○ Connection from San Jose / Salinas / Paso Robles / Wasco – shortest and fastest route between San Francisco and Los Angeles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Doug DeLong

Alignment and Station Alternatives – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question should be Altamont plus another option rather than Altamont or another option. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be land use controls where HSR stops in Central Valley. Don't create infrastructure for sprawl. HSR route should be via Dumbarton Bridge to reduce cost immensely and bring HSR to Silicon Valley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize elevated light-weight structures – even in country – to minimize impacts on the environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I'm proposing that all HSR be elevated, so even in the country you do not have an impact land from HST rail and fencing. Less of a footprint as you cross large areas. Use area below aerial structure for truck traffic to alleviate trucks on I-5, for example. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tracks must be elevated in urban and downtown areas to maximize local circulation. Must be done with good aesthetics. Adequate funding needed for such improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Japan, Germany, Europe, rail goes across the country. You're looking to keep this just regional. What about national? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Except Pacheco pass, most of HSR seems to be along freight railroad, and railroads are built on low grade. HSR should be able to do higher grades. Could HSR be in I-5 median? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HST systems should not serve areas such as Sacramento Valley (Redding to Sacramento), the North Coast, or Central Coast. Should be a statewide passenger rail system to serve these cities and act as feeder system to HST system. Start with existing rail rights-of-way. Then grade separate and build parallel right-of-way to bypass congestion points on private rail lines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gary Prost
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider new HST route from BNSF or UP near Fresno and Madera to a location just south of Gilroy, traversing near highway 146 in the east and Highway 156 in the west – labeled 152/Pacheco Southern Corridor alternative Cursory review indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No national, state or county parks. Minimal displacement of agricultural, residential, or commercial development. Geologically stable terrain. Minimal tunneling. Grade vertical displacement of 1%. Construction zone accessible via existing service roads to agriculture and utilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steve Rusconi
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider operating high-speed trains on BART alignment with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved signaling. Waiver of FRA regulations. Use of split trains. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> John Bacon
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider high-speed, non-stop, container-freight-only trains to Stockton. Consider eBART from North Concord BART Station to Vacaville and ultimately to Sacramento. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michael Sarahia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some people may still want not-so-fast train service to enjoy view. Time may not be a concern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tony Loney
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Los Angeles to Bakersfield route should not be via Mojave/ Palmdale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bill Hough

TOPIC 3: CONNECTIVITY AND COORDINATION WITH/IMPACTS TO OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Connectivity and Coordination with/Impacts to Other Transportation Facilities – Comments	Commentors
STATE AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review impacts on international airports, mass transit and highways that interface with HST. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review impacts on auto trips from SHS freeways to HST stations. PSR and plans required for crossings of SHS rights-of-way. Department's District Director must review plans prior to construction within SHS rights-of way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> California Department of Transportation
REGIONAL AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should evaluate connectivity of HST alignments to connecting transit systems. Should evaluate HST connection to San Jose International Airport, the only airport that will not receive service from HST system. Should consider impacts of HST alignment on freight needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSR can be used to connect inter-regional. Intra-regional can be connected through: small cars, small trains, operating at higher frequency, with many small stations with passing tracks instead of a few large stations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representative of BART speaking at scoping meeting
PRIVATE COMPANIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports HST system and technology that cooperates with and is compatible with existing and planning intercity rail systems. Supports HST station locations that directly connect with existing and planned intercity commuter rail stations. Pleased that current proposed HST stations include shared stations. Supports substantial improvement to conventional rail lines for faster, more frequent, and reliable service (CA 10-Year Rail Plan). Supports continued collaboration between Authority and AMTRAK. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMTRAK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of a railroad tunnel for Caltrain direct service into downtown San Francisco area is expensive, extravagant, and environmentally undesirable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Georgia Monorail Consortium
INDIVIDUALS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connections are important due to fear of getting stranded. Use 24/7 bus bridges like other cities have. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show connections between BART, ACE, and HST in Tri-Valley. Maps show gap between BART and other lines. BART connection to Livermore will serve ACE and HSR using an existing right-of-way for most of the route. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modesto Station needs to near regional transit hub – important for downtown. Link HSR stations to airports – SFO, Sacramento, Oakland. Stations should be multi-use, e.g., with hotel, offices, retail, and cultural. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSR needs to be coordination with Dumbarton Project, e.g., design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide stations with civic interests. Make them a place to be in. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michael Sydnor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Station location is extremely important. Locate in downtown or visitor spots or close to hotels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tony Loney
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will auto traffic, specifically parking, location to other transit systems, pedestrians or "foot traffic" be impacted? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card

TOPIC 4: EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation Criteria – Comments	Commentors
PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS & ASSOCIATIONS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ridership is key evaluation criteria for HST service into Bay Area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate each alternative for unused capacity to carry more trains. Evaluate each alternative for total population living with 20 miles of the tracks. Evaluate each alternative for potential additional ridership to be gained by serving local, interregional, commuter and intercity markets, using compatible trainsets. Evaluate how each alternative serves Silicon Valley north of San Jose Carefully peer review all downtown San Jose land use projections, i.e., as assumed for BART extension to San Jose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria are very important. If it's well done and we can get general acceptance, then logic will prevail. If it isn't done well, then study is subject to all kinds of ideas that come in from everywhere. The way to protect the study is to have a good set of criteria. Region is growing, so Vehicle Miles Traveled per year is going to grow. Maybe we need to talk about limiting that VMT to protect against more cars on more roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment from Train Riders Associate of California (TRAC) representative at scoping meeting
INDIVIDUALS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connections with other service. Operating costs. Capital costs. Impacts to wetlands/wildlife habitat. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise. Traffic/parking. Environmental Justice. Visual impacts. Growth-inducing impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to agricultural land. Potential for economic development in the Central Valley. Potential for housing in the inner Bay Area counties. Impacts of induced sprawl in the Central Valley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary evaluation criteria should be financial return (on capital). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jack Ringham
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination between rail and transit should be a criterion. Would add vehicle traffic as an option for connection – not just a ride on public transit from start to finish, but drive part way and then use public transit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker

TOPIC 5: TECHNOLOGIES

Alternative Technologies – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Train Riders Association of California (TRAC) is glad HSR is doing steel-wheel-on-steel rail rather than Maglev. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment from Train Riders Associate of California (TRAC) representative at scoping meeting
PRIVATE COMPANIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider HighRoad Rapid Transit System – dual-sided monorail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Georgia Monorail Consortium
INDIVIDUALS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy the Japanese Shinkansen design so we can use their good trains. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would you buy existing technology or would you succumb to designing your own or modifying existing technology? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current high-speed technologies are too slow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have read that Maglev is much less damaging to environment. You can build elevated guideways, so less impact on nature. Like to see maglev. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't understand why we are still talking about 220 mph. Technology can go faster. We ought to be looking toward 300 mph as top speed. At least build the infrastructure for it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider maglev option as in Shanghai airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't ignore new technology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michael Brennan

TOPIC 6: PROJECT FUNDING/COST/PRIORITY

Project Funding/Cost/Priority – Comments	Commentors
CITIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding with General Obligation Bonds to be paid from state general fund seems inappropriate and irresponsible at this time with current general fund deficit. Bond measure should be deferred or project should be funded using revenue bonds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Menlo Park
INDIVIDUALS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is great. About time. How can I help? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bob Barzan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sooner the better. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michael Brennan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hope project can move forward before inflation makes costs out of reason. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to get moving – now. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need rail now – are the least rail-supporting nation in the world. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building more transportation options builds more community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make cost under \$90 – needs to be cheaper than AMTRAK or plane. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card

Project Funding/Cost/Priority – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for construction is easy to find. Harder to find money for day-to-day operation of these facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't think HSR will be cost-effective and it will promote sprawl. Cannot be compared to air travel, given that this form of travel (air) does not have stops in between. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What makes the few elite who will use the serve so important that everyone else has to spend thousands of dollars to subsidize trips on those routes that are a bit faster than can be done today? Already have too many people whose actual travel costs to the economy are more than they pay in taxes. Our economy cannot take much more of this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can't charge enough per ticket to make the system pay for itself. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't aim too high for HST system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main thing here is HSR between San Francisco and Los Angeles is the most heavily traveled route via air. What are we doing to handle lobbying or other political opposition from the air industry? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HST system stations will generate immense profits for heretofore isolated parcels of land. California taxpayers should not finance public infrastructure that enriches real estate speculators. Should defray the capital cost of station, if not the alignments, using assessment districts. Joint development can thus be harnessed to recoup for the public the economic benefits from the HST investment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bill Stremmel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSR is hopelessly cost-ineffective and cannot be built. Projected costs are already \$40 billion and should be multiplied by 2 to 3 to realistically be built. Should be abandoned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSR is "nice to have," but there are many higher priority uses of California's scarce financial resources. Invest in "must haves" first. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can we build HST system when BART has not been extended to Livermore? Residents of Livermore have been paying taxes into the BART system for years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barbara Bowers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need fourth alternative. Rather than all or nothing for \$37 billion HST system, consider incremental upgrades of existing rail network strategic links, e.g., Bakersfield to Los Angeles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bill Hough
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider incremental upgrades as an alternative to spending \$37 billion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card

TOPIC 7: HEALTH AND SAFETY

Health and Safety – Comments	Commentors
STATE AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should evaluate if HST routes located in dam inundation area or unacceptable flooding risk. Should identify locations of faults and include design features to minimize adverse impacts. Should evaluate routes that would be adversely affected from wild land fires. Should evaluate alignments in terms of unstable slopes and possible landslides, which might affect safety of HST operations and the repair and maintenance of the HST system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governors Office of Emergency Services

Health and Safety – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should evaluate if alignments would affect emergency response and evacuation plans. Should review fire and police response times to HST stations. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to drinking water need to be reviewed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> California Department of Health Services
PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diablo Range Direct Alternative will introduce safety issues given limited law enforcement and safety personnel in the wilderness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranch owners along Diablo Range Direct alignment
INDIVIDUALS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What changes they made in Europe and Japan since 911 and what changes HSR has made? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make HSR stations capable of appropriate inspections. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card

TOPIC 8: ENVIRONMENTAL/PLANNING PROCESS

Environmental/Planning Process – Comments	Commentors
FEDERAL AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appreciate close working relationship with FRA and CHSRA Supports concept of HST system in California that can facilitate movement of people, while minimizing environmental impacts. Supports integration of San Francisco Bay Area Regional Rail Plan and HST planning / environmental work. Should defer decisions regarding specific project upgrades until regional vision is completed, e.g., proposal for Dumbarton Rail Bridge improvements for traditional rail service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
STATE AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like to thank HSR for their efforts to avoid transecting a number of parks (working back to 2000/20001). Have concerns with Mountain Crossing. There are about 10 parks in that shaded area. Has been a committed effort to avoid transecting Henry Coe, but still have concerns about impacts (noise, vibration) if it comes in the vicinity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment from State Parks representative at scoping meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> California State Parks Department has commented extensively on HSR EIR and appreciates the time HSR has been spent working with Parks Dept. We don't want to use up all the land so that residents still have preserved recreational areas, natural resources, and education destinations. We really appreciate the authority pulling out Henry Coe State Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment from State Parks representative at scoping meeting
COUNTY AGENCIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of NOP has been provided to the Santa Cruz County Supervisors, County Planning and Public Works Departments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County of Santa Cruz
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disappointed that only one scoping meeting was held in the Central Valley. Disappointed that scoping meeting held in Modesto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Merced County Supervisor, District One
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be considered a Responsible agency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Santa Clara Valley Water District

Environmental/Planning Process – Comments	Commentors
PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS & ASSOCIATIONS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selected alignment should be the one most beneficial to the most people, based on an impeccably fair and objective assessment of the situation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Train Riders Association of California
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRAC is delighted that HSR is doing EIR of optional passes. We believe that the right questions are finally being answered about these routes. Look forward to results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment from Train Riders Associate of California (TRAC) representative at scoping meeting
INDIVIDUALS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need State Transportation Policy Need State Land Use Policy Need State Water Policy Need State Environmental Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize existing rights-of-way and eliminate at-grade crossings. Make sure trains are plentiful and convenient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider fairness regarding land use/purchase of right-of-way. Don't want to see only low income communities moved/displaced. Affect on communities of concern should be no greater than communities of middle to high income. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make sure Altamont Pass alternatives get fair consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect agriculture and open space in Central Valley. Develop in foothills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSR will increase distance commuters are willing to travel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will HST ridership be done statewide? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who decides on HSR implementation? How are Board members chosen? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make sure Regional Rail Plan and HST planning are tied together. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSR is not separable from regional rail – cannot be studied, planned, and implemented or operated in a vacuum. Best performing capital investment maximizes use. Regional service can have huge available capacity (~16 trains/direction/hour) of HSR line – far beyond needed capacity of for exclusive long-distance travel. FRA vehicle design is a recipe for disaster – adopt UIC or Japanese design criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With regard to HSR stations, if someone can get from Los Angeles to Fresno or Bakersfield in an hour, there is a high likelihood that they will want to live where houses are less expensive. There is a potential for huge impacts. We have time to good planning and high-level mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress on this project is absolutely slow. It has been discussed for over 10 years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When we examined HST EIR, we could not find traffic data for Altamont or 152, nor could we find contamination data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scoping meeting speaker

Environmental/Planning Process – Comments	Commentors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We encourage updated EIR that specifically studies auto traffic to smog generation and traffic down to Central Valley and that this be included in further EIR 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HSR is not likely to be in use for another 20 years or so. What do we do in the mean time? We must keep in mind that population is still going to grow and there will be unmet needs. ▪ Don't loose sight of the fact there are areas outside of study area that have to be taken into account. ▪ Consider incremental approach: Almost all the projects I've seen have been built incrementally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider a cheap source of energy that is not oil dependent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Rail comment card
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think it's important to have a session in Sacramento on HSR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scoping meeting speaker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restrict or eliminate federal government as partner – will create more red tape and put federal government in position of power (as with AMTRAK, which the federal government would like to eliminate). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Michael Brennan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two studies (HST and San Francisco Bay Area Regional Rail Plan should be coordinated but separated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jack Ringham
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Volume I report, "Capital Corridor" should be spelled "Capitol Corridor." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Charlie Cameron

3.0 PREPARERS

Dave Mansen
Transportation / Transit Planning
Manager

Masters of Science, Urban Planning, Iowa State University,
Bachelor of Science, Computer Science, Iowa State University.
Has 30 years of experience managing complex, multi-disciplinary
transportation, land use, and environmental planning projects in
both public and private sectors.

- Project Manager